AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 2. This sheet, which includes Figure 2, replaces the original sheet including Figure 2. In Figure 2, reference numbers 400, 500, 501, 600 and 700 have been removed.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 19, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

At the outset, the Applicants note that the Office Action indicates that claims 1-36 are pending in the application and were examined. However, in the preliminary amendment filed June 26, 2006, claims 1-56 were canceled and claims 57-92 newly added. Accordingly, for the purposes of this response, the Applicants have considered the rejections in the Office Action to be with respect to claims 57-92 and not 1-36.

Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification for informalities noted therein. A Substitute Specification in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.125 is attached hereto. The Substitute Specification includes no new matter. The Substitute Specification amends the specification to include section headings. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Drawings

The Office Action objects to Figure 2 for the reasons set forth therein. Figure 2 has been amended to remove reference numbers 400, 500, 501, 600 and 700. It is noted that reference numbers 100 and 200 are included in the disclosure. *See, for*

example, page 8, lines 1-2. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Figure 2 be withdrawn.

Claim Amendments

Claims 57-66 and 68-92 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on page 9, lines 25-27. Claim 67 is hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 1-56 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 57-66 and 68-92 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 3, 6-10, 12-15, 17-19, 22, 25, 28-33 and 35 as being in improper form because of a multiple dependent claim. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Preliminary Amendment filed June 26, 2006 canceled claims 1-56 and added new claims 57-92. New claims 57-92 did not include any multiple dependent claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the objection of claims 3, 6-10, 12-15, 17-19, 22, 25, 28-33 and 35 be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 57-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490,575 issued to BERSTIS in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,924 issued to AINSBURY et al. (hereinafter "AINSBURY"), in further view of U.S.

Patent Publication Application No. 2003/0126277 (hereinafter SON) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,181,438 issued to SZABO. As previously discussed, claim 67 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.   Thus, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims.

     None of the references, singularly or in combination, teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 57-66 and 68-92.

     More specifically, independent claim 57, as amended, recites a method of searching, drafting and editing of electronic files using a meta-engine, which includes "a Search step, carried out by said meta-engine using one or more hypertext search engines, in which:A.1 the client performs a first-level search in the local copy of said history catalogue for the relevant context, and A.2 the server performs a second-level search in said history catalogue and in the cache of pages obtained in previous searches by any client; B. a documents Retrieval step, in which: B.1 the client searches the location of the documents, found in step A, in said index of physical locations of documents, B.2 the client asks the documents to the clients to which they belong, by a p2p communication accredited by the server, or B.3 the client asks the server to re-generate the documents, using originary data content, mark-up and commands; C. a step of Semantic Analysis of the Results, in which C.1 the client performs a first-level semantic analysis on the results

obtained in step B, and C.2 the server performs a second-level semantic analysis on the results rejected by the analysis of the client; D. a step of Storing and Updating, in which the server stores the results of the search, included the documents drafted later on their basis, in the form of composition commands and originary data content and mark-up, the server periodically updating all said catalogues, databases assembly and datacollections and said index of physical location of documents using the information relevant to the performed search." None of the references, singularly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features.

BERTSIS teaches a Global Search Engine that "receives search requests from users in a conventional manner-by matching keywords specified by the user to index entries pointing to addresses within its own internal index. Each 'Search' button or hypertext search link in the application now points to a particular HTML search index file residing on the server." *Column 5, lines 6-11.* In other words, the WWW, as taught by BERTSIS, is not a database, as claimed. Moreover, BERTSIS classifies all the network machines as HTTP server or site host, where the function distribution is realized by means of a hyperlink and CGI, technologies over they HTTP protocol. *See column 5, lines 20-40.*

Therefore, BERTSIS fails to teach or suggest at least "a step of Storing and Updating, in which the server stores the

results of the search, included in the documents drafted later on their basis, in the form of composition commands and originary data content and mark-up, the server periodically updating all said catalogues, databases assembly and datacollections and said index of physical location of documents using the information relevant to the performed search," as claimed in claim 57.

Further, the Office Action admits that BERTSIS fails to teach or suggest "said databases assembly comprising one or more catalogues relevant to the documents, the method being characterized in that the final documents obtained by the search or drafted on its basis are resident on client, the server maintaining instead originary data content, mark-up and commands for re-composing such final documents, the databases assembly comprising a history catalogue of the searches already carried out for each context by any client and an index of physical locations of documents, the index being updated by the server." *Office Action, page 6.* In an attempt to overcome these deficiencies, the Office Action relies on AINSBURY to teach these features. However, ANISBURY fails to teach or suggest at least these features.

While AINSBURY may teach an information platform which automates the collection of data, a method for organizing a library of information and provides an analysis using multiple-content types, AINSBURY teaches that the database is automatically updated by the server after each search.

Therefore, AINSBURY cannot be considered to teach "databases assembly comprising a history catalogue of the searches already carried out for each context by any client and an index of physical locations of documents, the index being updated by the server," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, SON and SZABO fail to address the previously noted shortcomings of BERTSIS in view of AINSBURY.

In fact, SON is only relied upon for its purported teaching of a search step and a document retrieval step, as claimed. In this respect, it is to be noted that SON teaches only the request from the client of multimedia data, not a history catalogue. *See paragraph [0011], lines 1-15*. Moreover, SON is only relied upon for its purported teaching of buffering data, not sending data in the form of originary data content, mark-up and commands, as claimed.

SZABO is only relied upon for its purported teaching of a step of semantic analysis, as claimed. In this respect, it is noted that SZABO fails to disclose a two-level semantic analysis, but rather a level structure that refers to a graphic representation. See column 18, lines 25-50.

Therefore, SON and SZABO fail to address the previously noted shortcomings of BERTSIS in view of AINSBURY because their teachings are different from the claimed invention.

In any case, even if one of ordinary skill in the art contemplated modifying BERTSIS in view of AINSBURY in further

view of SON and in further view of SZABO, the resulting modification would still fail to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the teaching of BERTSIS in view of AINSBURY in further view of SON and in further view of SZABO fails to render the claimed invention obvious.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 57 is patentably distinguishable over BERTSIS in view of AINSBURY in further view of SON and in further view of SZABO. Likewise, claims 58-66 and 68-92, which depend from claim 57 are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 58-66 and 68-92 over BERTSIS in view of AINSBURY in further view of SON and in further view of SZABO be withdrawn.

Entry of the above amendments is earnestly solicited. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

This response is believed to be fully responsive and to put the case in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

_____/Elizabeth M. Keaney/_____
Elizabeth M. Keaney, Reg. 60,437
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
        (703) 979-4709

EMK/fb

APPENDIX:
      The Appendix includes the following item(s):

☐ - a terminal disclaimer

☐ - a 37 CFR 1.132 Declaration

☐ - a new or amended Abstract of the Disclosure

☒ - a Replacement Sheet for Figure 2 of the drawings

☒ - a Substitute Specification and a marked-up copy of the
      previously-filed substitute specification

☐ - a verified English translation of foreign priority document